



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,341	03/04/2002	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920010348US1	3890

7590 01/03/2005

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER

FRANCIS, MARK P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N . 10/090,341	Applicant(s) BATES ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark P. Francis	Art Unit 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7,9-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wimble.(5812850)

With respect to claims 1 and 9, Wimble teaches a method of initiating a debugging session for the code;(See Abstract, lines 1-8, “provides an interactive...”)(Col 3,lines 35-38, “the debugging session...”)
accessing the associated data in the repository during the debugging session;(Col 8, lines 19-26, “in the same database...”)
and determining whether the associated data can be displayed during the debugging session.(Col 7, lines 61-67, “Stack Viewer displays...”)

With respect to claim 16, Wimble teaches a computer-readable medium containing a debug program which, when executed, performs an operation of debugging code having associated data in a repository, the debug program comprising:

Art Unit: 2124

a debugger user interface(See Fig. 1 element 22); and
a debug engine(Col 26, lines 21-25 "a debugger engine... " & See Fig. 3 element 54)
configured to selectively pass data to the debugger user interface according to
predefined access restriction rules (Col. 19, lines 1-2 "a few predefined access ...")
defining at least one rule preventing at least a portion of the associated data from being
displayed to a user.

With respect to claims 2 and 10, the rejection of claims 1 and 9 respectively, is
incorporated and further, Wimble teaches wherein determining whether the associated
data can be displayed comprises determining whether the associated data can be
provided to a debugger user interface. (Col 6, lines 33-47, "It is not often that the ..."
and See Fig. 3 elements 60(interface), 61(data), 63(data))

With respect to claims 3,11, and 17, the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 16 respectively, is
incorporated and further, Wimble teaches comprising:
determining that the associated data cannot be displayed during the
debugging session(Col 19, lines 11-15 "the debugger couldn't determine..."), and
outputting text characters on an output screen indicative of the associated
data without revealing a value of the associated data.

With respect to claims 4,12, and 18, the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 16 respectively, is
incorporated and further, Wimble teaches wherein determining whether the associated
data can be displayed comprises referencing a restricted data table (Col 28, lines 3-5,
"said information database") created in response to reading the associated data from
the repository and according to predefined access

Art Unit: 2124

restriction rules.(Col 28, lines 3-5 “accessing formula”)

With respect to claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 respectively, is incorporated and further, Wimble teaches, wherein determining whether the associated data can be displayed is performed by a debugging program.(Col 3, lines 49-51 “debugging of ...”)

With respect to claims 6 and 7, the rejection of claim 1 respectively, is incorporated and further, Wimble teaches wherein determining whether the associated data can be displayed is performed by a debugging program implementing access restriction rules(Col 28, lines 27-29 “accessing formula...”) defining at least one rule preventing at least a portion of the associated data from being displayed.(Col. 28, lines 35-38 “comprises a formula...”)

With respect to claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 respectively, is incorporated and further, Wimble teaches wherein accessing the associated data in the repository comprises reading a record and wherein determining whether the associated data can be displayed comprises:

referencing access restriction rules defining at least one rule preventing at least one field value from being displayed(Col 19, lines 1-9 “predefined access formulas ...”), and

determining whether the record contains the at least one field value.(Col 19, lines 11-15 “the Debugger couldn’t determine..”)

With respect to claim 19, the rejection of claim 16 respectively, is incorporated and further, Wimble teaches wherein the at least one rule(Col 15, lines 14-17 “a formula...”) defines a value and an associated value(Col 15, lines 23-28 “read the value...”), wherein

Art Unit: 2124

if the associated value has been displayed the debug engine will not provide the value to the debugger user interface for display.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wimble in view of Kolawa (6,085,029).

With respect to claims 8 and 14, the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of claims 1 and 9, respectively is incorporated and further, Wimble does not show wherein determining whether the associated data can be displayed comprises referencing a parse expression defining a data format and an output expression defining a restricted portion of the parse expression.

Kolawa shows wherein determining whether the associated data can be displayed comprises referencing a parse expression (Col 5, lines 46-50 "a parsing...") defining a data format and an output expression (Col 7, lines 28-35 "...form of debug output") defining a restricted portion of the parse expression in an analogous debugging program for the purpose to generate code for the target program which not only functions as was originally intended, but also contains calls to instrumentation procedures which provide automatic error detection of dynamic program errors as well as an ability to automatically generate test cases. (Col 7, lines 36-41)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reference a parse expression for determining data to be displayed during a debugging session.

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to develop a method of automatically instrumenting a computer program for dynamic debugging as an integral part of the program development cycle and without introducing an extra stage in the program development cycle. (Col 2, lines 27-33 "an extra stage ...")

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wimble in view of Kolawa (6,085,029).

With respect to claim 20, the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of claim 16, respectively is incorporated and further, Wimble does not show wherein the at least one rule defines a parse expression (Col 5, lines 46-50 "a parsing...") defining a data format and an output expression defining a restricted portion of the parse expression, whereby all values having restricted portion will not be provided to the debugger user interface for display. Kolawa shows wherein the at least one rule defines a parse expression defining a data format and an output expression (Col 7, lines 28-35 "...form of debug output") defining a restricted portion of the parse expression (Col 15, line 49 "parse tree..."), whereby all values having restricted portion will not be provided to the debugger user interface for

Art Unit: 2124

display(Col 16, lines 53-61 "interface is inserted...") in an analogous debugging program for the purpose to generate code for the target program which not only functions as was originally intended, but also contains calls to instrumentation procedures which provide automatic error detection of dynamic program errors as well as an ability to automatically generate test cases. (Col 7, lines 36-41)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reference a parse expression, whereby all values that contain restricted portion will not be provided for determining data to be displayed during a debugging session.

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to develop a method of automatically instrumenting a computer program for dynamic debugging as an integral part of the program development cycle and without introducing an extra stage in the program development cycle. (Col 2, lines 27-33 "an extra stage ...")

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Khan teaches a minimally intrusive debugging system for use by multiple users for independently debugging a common software target in a client and server environment.

Art Unit: 2124

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark P. Francis whose telephone number is (571)272-7956. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER